UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,499	03/04/2002	Anthony J. Dezonno	6065-82964	6038

24628 7590 01/13/2010

Husch Blackwell Sanders, LLP
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP Welsh & Katz
120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA
22ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
GENACK, MATTHEW W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,499	DEZONNO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW W. GENACK	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 October 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5-8, 13-15, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0035474, in view of Gorin *et al.*, "HOW MAY I HELP YOU?", October 1996, AT&T Research, in view of Andersen *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,640,231.

Regarding Claims 1, 8, and 15, Alpdemir discloses a method, system, and business model for an information system and service having business self-promotion features whereby consumers call an information center associated with a business using a regular telephone (Abstract, [0002] Lines 1-7, [0018], Fig. 1). A live agent may handle some calls ([0059], [0110] Lines 1-7). A caller may submit a query pertaining to the activities of the business ([0002], [0018], [0085], [0094], [0141] Lines 1-5). The user's question can then be translated into Voice Extensible Markup Language (VXML) with a speech-to-text (STT) conversion engine ([0138] Lines 1-17, Fig. 1). Artificial intelligence is used in the processing and answering of the query ([0141] Lines 7-9). A text-to-speech (TTS) engine and speech server are used to provide the answer to the caller (Abstract, [0139] Lines 1-5, [0143] Lines 1-11, Fig. 1).

Alpdemir does not expressly disclose receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence, forming a natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers and selecting the most probable answer, wherein the artificial intelligence engine implements second order logic and incorporates the expertise of a live agent, and providing the natural language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection.

Gorin *et al.* discloses a method of processing calls in a call processing center, comprising receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence (Page 2, first column, Lines 2-9, 13, 28, and 43), forming natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers and selecting the most probable answer (Page 2, first column, Lines 14, 16, 29, 31, 34-39, 44, 46, 48, 57, 59, Page 2 second column, Lines 4 and 7-10), wherein the artificial intelligence engine incorporates the expertise of a live agent (Page 1, second column, Line 23 to Page 2, second column, Line 12), and providing the natural language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir by providing the means for receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence, forming natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers

and selecting the most probable answer, wherein the artificial intelligence engine incorporates the expertise of a live agent, and providing the natural language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide automated services to non-expert users, thereby alleviating the burden on human agents of providing responses to redundant inquiries (Gorin *et al.*: Abstract).

Neither Alpdemir nor Gorin *et al.* expressly discloses an artificial intelligence engine that implements second order logic.

Andersen *et al.* discloses an artificial intelligence engine that implements second order logic (Abstract, Column 2 Lines 17-41, Column 3 Lines 1-20, Column 10 Lines 1-15, Column 11 Line 65 to Column 12 Line 2, Fig. 1).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* by modifying the artificial intelligence engine to implement second order logic.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to facilitate the creation of new sentences from a given sentence (Andersen *et al.*: Column 9 Line 51 to Column 10 Line 42).

Regarding Claim 5, it is inherent that an artificial intelligence engine used for answering caller's queries would utilize the expertise and inputs associated with a live agent.

Regarding Claims 6 and 13, Alpdemir discloses that a personal computer (PC), personal digital assistant (PDA), or other appliance capable of displaying HTML pages may submit a query to the information center (Abstract, [0139] Lines 8-19, Fig. 1).

Regarding Claim 7, the queries are limited to pertaining to the activities of the business, as outlined above.

Alpdemir does not expressly disclose enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate inquiries.

Gorin *et al.* discloses enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate inquiries (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir by enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate inquiries.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to allow the artificial intelligence engine to process ambiguous input (Gorin *et al.*: Page 2, first column, Lines 34-35).

Regarding Claim 14, Alpdemir discloses that a user may inquire about a category, a category and a location, or any item or combination of items ([0108]).

Regarding Claim 18, a live agent may handle some calls, as outlined above.

Regarding Claim 19, Alpdemir discloses that a query may be submitted via email ([0054]).

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir in view of Gorin *et al.*, further in view of Saylor *et al.*

Alpdemir discloses a method, system, and business model for an information system and service having business self-promotion features whereby consumers call an information center associated with a business using a regular telephone (Abstract, [0002] Lines 1-7, [0018], Fig. 1). A live agent may handle some calls ([0059], [0110] Lines 1-7). A caller may submit a query pertaining to the activities of the business ([0002], [0018], [0085], [0094], [0141] Lines 1-5). The user's question can then be translated into Voice Extensible Markup Language (VXML) with a speech-to-text (STT) conversion engine ([0138] Lines 1-17, Fig. 1). Artificial intelligence is used in the processing and answering of the query ([0141] Lines 7-9). A text-to-speech (TTS) engine and speech server are used to provide the answer to the caller (Abstract, [0139] Lines 1-5, [0143] Lines 1-11, Fig. 1). The requested information may be passed through a text-to-speech engine and speech server and played on the user's telephone (Abstract, [0139] Lines 1-5, [0143] Lines 1-11, Fig. 1).

Alpdemir does not expressly disclose receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence, forming a natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers and selecting the most probable answer based upon incorporating expertise of a live agent, enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate answers, and providing the natural

language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection.

Gorin *et al.* discloses a method of processing calls in a call processing center, comprising receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence (Page 2, first column, Lines 2-9, 13, 28, and 43), forming natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers and selecting the most probable answer (Page 2, first column, Lines 14, 16, 29, 31, 34-39, 44, 46, 48, 57, 59, Page 2 second column, Lines 4 and 7-10), enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate answers (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4), and providing the natural language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir by providing the means for receiving a query in the form of a natural language sentence, forming natural language answer to said query by correlating the query against a plurality of answers and selecting the most probable answer based upon incorporating expertise of a live agent, enabling the artificial intelligence engine to generalize otherwise indeterminate answers, and providing the natural language answer so as to simulate a natural language conversation with the caller without use of menu selection.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide automated services to non-expert users (Gorin *et al.*: Abstract), and in order to allow the artificial intelligence engine to process ambiguous input (Gorin *et al.*: Page 2, first column, Lines 34-35).

Neither Alpdemir nor Gorin *et al.* expressly disclose the conversion of an answer into an extensible markup language.

Saylor *et al.* discloses a system and method whereby voice codes store content, said content being accessible by telephone (Abstract, Column 1 Lines 62-66, Column 5 Lines 12-14). A user calls a call processing center, and said call center processes an information request from said user via a voice browser module that uses speech recognition to interpret the user's request for information. This information may be disseminated by an organization whose purpose is commerce-related (Column 3 Lines 36-41, Column 5 Lines 41-42 and 55). The user may ask a business-related question (Column 17 Lines 13-16). The VXML information may be passed through a TTS in order to create a sound file that is subsequently played for the user (Column 8 Lines 16-34); alternatively, the VXML information may delivered to the user as a text file (Column 8 Lines 34-38).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* by providing for the conversion, by the AI engine, of the provided answer into an extensible markup language.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this

modification because the customer may be using a device that is more suited to receiving an answer in extensible markup language form than in the form of synthesized speech.

4. Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir in view of Gorin *et al.*, further in view of Andersen *et al.*, further in view of Gavan *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,601,048, further in view of Dezonmo, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,333.

Alpdemir does not expressly disclose enabling the artificial intelligence engine to draw inferences to form a context for forming the answer to the query, nor the use of a caller call record by the artificial intelligence engine in the processing of a call.

Gorin *et al.* discloses enabling the artificial intelligence engine to draw inferences to form a context for forming the answer to the query (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* as modified by Andersen *et al.* by enabling the artificial intelligence engine to draw inferences to form a context for forming the answer to the query.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to allow the artificial intelligence engine to process ambiguous input (Gorin *et al.*: Page 2, first column, Lines 34-35).

Neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.* expressly discloses the use of a caller call record by the artificial intelligence engine in the processing of a call.

Gavan *et al.* discloses a system and method for processing event records for the purposes of detecting and managing fraud (Abstract, Column 2 Lines 18-28). Specifically, in the context of telecommunications fraud detection, artificial intelligence is used to monitor event records that are stored in a call history database, said records containing information pertaining to the identity of the caller and the called parties (Column 3 Lines 38-64, Column 11 Lines 4-65, Figs. 2 and 4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* as modified by Andersen *et al.* by providing for use of call records, said call records containing information pertaining to identity and contact history, by an artificial intelligence engine in the processing of a call.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification so as to provide a less rigid system of pattern analysis in the processing of a telecommunications traffic (Gavan *et al.*: Column 2 Lines 6-15).

Neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.*, nor Gavan *et al.* expressly discloses the simultaneous delivery of a caller call record and said caller's call to a network device.

Dezonmo discloses an apparatus and method for identifying a call record that is to be delivered from one automatic call distributor to another automatic call distributor (Abstract, Column 2 Line 60 to Column 3 Line 13, Figs. 1-2). Customer records for a caller, and said caller's call, are delivered to a selected agent simultaneously (Column 7 Lines 30-44).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.*, as modified by Andersen *et al.*, as modified by Gavan *et al.* by providing for the simultaneous delivery of a caller's call and call records to the artificial intelligence engine.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to expedite the handling of the call (Dezonmo: Column 7 Line 55 to Column 8 Line 3).

5. Claims 3, 10-11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir in view of Gorin *et al.*, further in view of Andersen *et al.*, further in view of Saylor *et al.*

Regarding Claims 3 and 10, neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.* expressly discloses the conversion of an answer into an extensible markup language.

Saylor *et al.* discloses a system and method whereby voice codes store content, said content being accessible by telephone (Abstract, Column 1 Lines 62-66, Column 5 Lines 12-14). A user calls a call processing center, and said call center

processes an information request from said user via a voice browser module that uses speech recognition to interpret the user's request for information. This information may be disseminated by an organization whose purpose is commerce-related (Column 3 Lines 36-41, Column 5 Lines 41-42 and 55). The user may ask a business-related question (Column 17 Lines 13-16). The VXML information may be passed through a TTS in order to create a sound file that is subsequently played for the user (Column 8 Lines 16-34); alternatively, the VXML information may delivered to the user as a text file (Column 8 Lines 34-38).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* as modified by Andersen *et al.* by providing for the conversion, by the AI engine, of the provided answer into an extensible markup language.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because the customer may be using a device that is more suited to receiving an answer in extensible markup language form than in the form of synthesized speech.

Regarding Claim 11, Alpdemir discloses that the requested information may be passed through a text-to-speech engine and speech server and played on the user's telephone (Abstract, [0139] Lines 1-5, [0143] Lines 1-11, Fig. 1).

Regarding Claim 17, neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.* expressly discloses the conversion of an answer into an extensible markup language using information from web page documents.

Saylor *et al.* discloses a system and method whereby voice codes store content, said content being accessible by telephone (Abstract, Column 1 Lines 62-66, Column 5 Lines 12-14). A user calls a call processing center, and said call center processes an information request from said user via a voice browser module that uses speech recognition to interpret the user's request for information. This information may be disseminated by an organization whose purpose is commerce-related (Column 3 Lines 36-41, Column 5 Lines 41-42 and 55). The user may ask a business-related question (Column 17 Lines 13-16). The VXML information may be passed through a TTS in order to create a sound file that is subsequently played for the user (Column 8 Lines 16-34); alternatively, the VXML information may delivered to the user as a text file (Column 8 Lines 34-38). The VXML information may be stored as web pages (Column 4 Line 46 to Column 5 Line 11).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* as modified by Andersen *et al.* by providing for the conversion, by the AI engine, of the provided answer into an extensible markup language using information from web page documents.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because the customer may be using a device that is more suited to receiving an answer in extensible markup language form than in the form of synthesized speech.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir in view of Gorin *et al.*, further in view of Andersen *et al.*, further in view of Horowitz *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,349,290.

Alpdemir discloses that the requested information may be passed through a text-to-speech engine and speech server and played on the user's telephone (Abstract, [0139] Lines 1-5, [0143] Lines 1-11, Fig. 1).

Alpdemir does not expressly disclose that the method of processing calls mimics a live agent.

Gorin *et al.* discloses the method of processing calls mimics a live agent (Page 2, first column, Lines 12-16, 27-31, 42-48, 55-60, Page 2 second column, Lines 1-4).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir by providing the means for processing calls in a manner that mimics a live agent.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to allow the user to provide clarification to the artificial intelligence engine [just as a live agent is able to receive clarification from a user] (Page 2, first column, Lines 34-39).

Neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.* expressly discloses the use of a caller's identity and contact history by an artificial intelligence engine to support enterprise activities.

Horowitz *et al.* discloses a system and method for the automated, customized presentation of a financial institution's services and products to a customer

accessing said financial institution's intelligent voice response (IVR) system via telephone, whereby the system makes use of artificial intelligence (Abstract, Column 5 Lines 21-38, Column 11 Lines 14-27, Column 23 Line 58 to Column 24 Line 9, Column 29 Lines 1-8, Fig. 6). A call is processed according to the caller's identity and contact history (Column 42 Line 53 to Column 43 Line 6, Fig. 35).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.* as modified by Andersen *et al.* by providing the means for the artificial intelligence engine to make use of a caller's identity and contact history to support enterprise activities.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to offer products and services to a customer that match the business's perception of said customer's need (Horowitz *et al.*: Column 1 Lines 36-62).

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alpdemir in view of Gorin *et al.*, further in view of Andersen *et al.*, further in view of Saylor *et al.*, further in view of Bigus *et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0084010.

It is inherent that an artificial intelligence engine used for answering caller's queries [which is what Gorin *et al.* discloses] would utilize the expertise and inputs associated with a live agent.

Neither Alpdemir, nor Gorin *et al.*, nor Andersen *et al.*, nor Saylor *et al.* expressly discloses the use of forward and backward chaining by an artificial intelligence engine.

Bigus *et al.* discloses the use of forward and backward chaining by an artificial intelligence engine in the context of a method wherein product support services are provided to customers (Abstract, [0011]-[0012], [0086]).

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Alpdemir as modified by Gorin *et al.*, as modified by Andersen *et al.*, as modified by Saylor *et al.* by providing for the use of forward and backward chaining by an artificial intelligence engine.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to facilitate the identification, by the artificial intelligence engine, of recurring patterns that indicate an undesirable operational condition in the process of aiding a customer (Bigus *et al.*: [0087]).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 26 October 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states, on Page 8 of Remarks, that "The Office Action suggests that the reference to AI in Alpdemir must be read within the context of the invention. However. It is not a question of taking this statement outside a given context, but of reading what is actually disclosed. The statement about AI is no more than an observation that AI is known, it does not state that it should be used or how it should be used or what it should

be used for, such unstated use is merely being assumed in the Office Action." Applicant fails to note that the sentence in question is in the section of the reference titled "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EMBODIMENTS OF THE INVENTION." It is incumbent on Applicant to explain why such a sentence, in a paragraph that starts with "Embodiments of the inventive system", in a section with the aforementioned title, has no connection with the system disclosed by Alpdemir.

Applicant states, on Page 8 of Remarks, that "the reference [Alpdemir] does not describe or suggest anything related to the claimed use of AI to form answers to the queries." Gorin *et al.*, and not Alpdemir, is relied on for the disclosure of this feature.

Applicant asserts, on Page 9 of Remarks, that "independent claims 1, 15, and 20 also call for an artificial intelligence engine with a knowledge universe comprising enterprise activities of the organization. This is also not disclosed by Alpdemir." On the contrary, the information that the system of Alpdemir provides pertains to the business operating said system (Abstract, Figs. 1-2); Alpdemir does not give examples of any information provided by the system that is not merchant-related.

Applicant asserts, on Page 9 of Remarks, that "Gorin does not mention use of an artificial intelligence engine." On the contrary, the spoken dialog system described on Pages 1-2 of Gorin *et al.* is, functionally, an AI engine. Several examples of natural language conversations between said system and a human are provided on Page 2.

Applicant asserts, on Page 10 of Remarks, that "Claims 2, 9, and 16 also now call for the AI engine to draw inferences from call records to form answers which is also not taught by the cited references". On the contrary, the conversation examples

provided by Gorin *et al.* on Page 2 clearly involve the use of inferences by the system, since ambiguities are resolved by the system using various clues.

Applicant asserts, on Page 11 of Remarks, that "Claim 17 calls for the AI engine to use information from web page documents to form answers in VXML and incorporating VXML responses into documents delivered to the caller in response to the call (see e.g., p. 8, first paragraph). This feature is also not taught by the cited references." On the contrary, Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the following excerpt from the rejection of Claim 17: " A user calls a call processing center, and said call center processes an information request from said user via a voice browser module that uses speech recognition to interpret the user's request for information. This information may be disseminated by an organization whose purpose is commerce-related (Column 3 Lines 36-41, Column 5 Lines 41-42 and 55). The user may ask a business-related question (Column 17 Lines 13-16). The VXML information may be passed through a TTS in order to create a sound file that is subsequently played for the user (Column 8 Lines 16-34); alternatively, the VXML information may delivered to the user as a text file (Column 8 Lines 34-38)." Furthermore, the VXML information may be stored as web pages (Column 4 Line 46 to Column 5 Line 11).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW W. GENACK whose telephone number is (571)272-7541. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM to 5 PM Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew W Genack/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617